

I. 22 Apr 75

Approved For Release 2002/04/04 : CIA-RDP82S00697R000300090007-1

A 30

PRC
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

PRC, SRI LANKA AGREE ON SHIPPING TAX EXEMPTION

Peking NCNA in English 1613 GMT 19 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Colombo, April 18, 1975 (HSINHUA)--In order to further promote the joint shipping service between the Republic of Sri Lanka and the People's Republic of China, letters providing for mutual exemption from income and other taxes on freight earnings by vessels of China and Sri Lanka in their ports were exchanged at a ceremony here today by Sri Lanka Minister of Shipping P. G. B. Kalugalle and Chinese Ambassador to Sri Lanka Huang Ming-ta.

The China-Sri Lanka joint shipping service, which was established in 1972, has developed constantly. The mutual exemption from taxes would further promote the relations of friendship and cooperation and joint shipping service between the two countries.

CONTINUING REPORTAGE ON LAW OF SEA CONFERENCE

Soviet Draft Text Rapped

Peking NCNA in English 2237 GMT 18 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Geneva, April 17, 1975 (HSINHUA)--The draft text on marine scientific research advanced by the Soviet Union and other countries was discussed at plenary meetings of the Third Committee of the 3d United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on April 10 and 17. Representatives of a number of countries pointed out in their speeches that many articles of the draft text are detrimental to the sovereignty and security of the coastal states and serve the interests of the marine powers. Therefore, the draft text is unacceptable.

The Soviet draft stipulates that scientific research in the economic zone unrelated to exploration and exploitation of resources can be conducted with advance "notification" to a coastal state. This aroused opposition from many countries including Pakistan, Algeria, Nigeria, Kenya, Albania, China, Yugoslavia, Chile and Canada. The Pakistan representative said that this would deprive the coastal state of basic jurisdiction over its economic zone. The Pakistan and Nigerian representatives both emphasized that consent from a coastal state must be obtained before scientific research may be conducted in waters under its jurisdiction, because this has to do with its sovereignty and security.

The Algerian representative said that the Soviet draft only set obligations for the coastal states without defining their due rights. As is well known, the developing countries are unable to conduct scientific research in the off-shore waters of the developed countries. The draft affirms such factual inequality.

The representative of Kenya said that he found it difficult to accept that an outside state could have jurisdiction in matters which were within the national jurisdiction of another state.

The Albanian representative said that it is the right of a coastal state to exercise full control over marine scientific research conducted by other states within its territorial waters, as well as within its exclusive economic zone and continental shelf.

Cont'd

I. 22 Apr 75

A 29

PRC
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Chi, Tindemans Continue Talks

Peking NCNA in English 1201 GMT 21 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Peking, April 21, 1975 (HSINHUA)--Chinese Vice-Premier Chi Teng-kuei continued talks with the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Belgium Leo Tindemans here this afternoon.

PRC, BELGIUM SIGN MARITIME, CIVIL AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENTS

Peking NCNA in English 1500 GMT 20 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Peking, April 20, 1975 (HSINHUA)--A maritime agreement and an agreement relating to civil air transport between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium were signed in Peking today.

~~Belgian~~ Belgian Prime Minister Leo Tindemans and Madame Tindemans and Chinese Vice-Premier Chi Teng-kuei were present at the signing ceremony.

Chinese Foreign Minister Chiao Kuan-hua and Belgian Foreign Minister Renaat Van Elslande signed the agreements on behalf of their respective governments.

Present at the signing ceremony on the Belgian side were members of Prime Minister Tindemans' party including Madame Van Elslande, Jacques Groothaert and Madame Groothaert, Eduard Grandry, Jan Grauls, Jan Robert Vanden Bloock, Marc Defossez and Jean-Paul Van Bellinghen.

Present at the signing ceremony on the Chinese side were Vice-Foreign Minister Ho Ying; Vice-Minister of Communications Yu Mei; director-general of the General Administration of Civil Aviation of China Ma Jen-hui and Chinese Ambassador to Belgium Li Lien-pi.

AGREEMENT REACHED WITH GREECE ON TRADEMARK REGISTRATION

Peking NCNA in English 1619 GMT 19 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Peking, April 19, 1975 (HSINHUA)--With a view to strengthening the friendly relations between China and Greece and promoting trade, Chinese Minister of Foreign Trade Li Chiang and Greek Ambassador to China Nikolaos Katapodhis, on behalf of their respective governments, exchanged notes here today to confirm the agreement reached between the two countries on the registration of trade marks on a reciprocal basis.

CHINA-VIETNAM BORDER RAILWAY PROTOCOL SIGNED 19 APRIL

Peking NCNA in English 1249 GMT 20 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Hanoi, April 20, 1975 (HSINHUA)--The protocol of the 17th meeting of the China-Vietnam border railway was signed here yesterday. Lo Chiang, leader of the Chinese railway delegation, and Ha Dang An, leader of the Vietnamese railway delegation signed the protocol.

The meeting began on April 8. Phan Trong Tue, vice-premier of the Vietnamese Government, received all members of the Chinese delegation and congratulated them on the success of the meeting.

During its stay here the Chinese railway delegation visited Hanoi and Quang Ninh. The delegation left here by train for home today.

The Chinese representative pointed out that this provision in the Soviet draft actually nullifies the jurisdiction of the coastal states over marine scientific research. The Soviet proposition, he noted, gives the superpowers a free hand to carry out all furtive activities under the pretext of scientific research. He reaffirmed that in order to safeguard their state sovereignty and security and defend their national economic interests, numerous Third World and other countries have maintained that marine scientific research conducted in the sea area under the national jurisdiction of a coastal state must obtain the prior consent of the coastal state concerned. This is entirely reasonable. The provision in the Soviet draft, he said, imposes obligations on the coastal states, thus encroaching upon their sovereignty and independence.

The so-called "freedom of scientific research" stipulated in the Soviet draft was also opposed by many developing countries. The Algerian representative said that the draft fully ignores the just proposition put forward by a great number of the small and medium-sized countries and still insists on the so-called "freedom of scientific research" on the high seas, completely disregarding the role of the international machinery to be set up soon. The developing countries, he added, strongly demand that a new international economic order be established. The draft should not confirm the unjust old international economic order.

The Albanian representative pointed out that the Soviet draft permits so-called "freedom of scientific research". This only means that the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, have the freedom to make strategic studies and plunder the resources of other countries and to carry out their aggressive and hegemonic policies.

The Chinese representative said that his delegation strongly maintains that marine scientific research conducted in the international sea area shall be subjected to appropriate regulation by the international regime and the international machinery which are to be set up.

The Brazilian representative exposed the fictitiousness of so-called marine scientific research for "peaceful purposes" as the draft has claimed. He said that the draft stipulates for "the freedom of (marine) scientific research" on the high seas, but this does not conform to the principle that the high seas are the common wealth of mankind.

The Indian representative said that with respect to the possible abuse of research facilities, the Soviet proposal did not state what would happen should the coastal state determine that the facilities were being used for other than peaceful purposes. If such a situation arose, the coastal state should be able to take action against the offender either by suspending the research or by expelling the offender from the area under its jurisdiction.

Superpowers Impede Progress

Peking NCNA in English 2033 GMT 20 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Geneva, April 19, 1975 (HSINHUA)--The third session of the 3d United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea held its first plenary meeting here yesterday after a month's group discussions at the first, second and third committees.

Cont'd

Representatives of many developing countries expressed discontent with the slow progress of the conference. They pointed out that obstacles have come "to the superpowers. They strongly demanded that a new regime of the law of the sea should be worked out on the basis of equal footing and extensive consultations.

People take note of the fact that since the present session began on March 17, the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, have resorted to all threats and pressure trying to impose their hegemonist views on others so as to continue their domination and monopoly of the sea.

The Albanian representative noted that the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, by various manoeuvres obstructed the session from making progress in efforts to safeguard their political, military and economic interests and serve their policies of aggression and expansion for world hegemony and domination over the sea. He said that the two superpowers opposed the open examination of the key problems of the sea law and made efforts to seek a "solution" without the knowledge of the conference, in order that the overwhelming majority of the participating countries have to accept the fait accompli.

The Chinese representative pointed out that compelled by the situation, the superpowers sometimes changed their tactics at the session. While professing their readiness to "negotiate", they remained adamant in their positions on issues of substance. He told the meeting that the superpower which claims to be "the natural ally of the developing countries", continued to assert that the exclusive economic zone is part of the high sea. It insisted on the "freedom of scientific research" and the "freedom of navigation" in the exclusive economic zone of other states. It wanted to have "freedom of navigation" even in straits lying within the territorial sea of other states and opposed innocent passage. The other superpower took a similar stand. It declared that if no agreement is reached, it threatens to start unilateral exploitation of the seabed resources. All these worn-out lingo serve one purpose of maintaining the old law of the sea and pressing for marine hegemony, the Chinese representative said.

The representative of Ireland opposed any unilateral action on exploitation of the resources of the seabed and ocean floor before an agreement on this was reached at the sea law conference. He pointed out that states and persons should refrain from all activities of such exploitations pending the establishment of a new regime on exploitation of the resources of the area of seabed and ocean floor and subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. He urged that a decision be made at the present session accordingly.

The representative of Guatemala said, there were so many disputed questions at the session, this is because some powers were expanding on the sea and seeking hegemony there. Their attempts must be frustrated, he said.

Representatives of Venezuela and Tanzania also pointed out that the session must not work under a certain kind of pressure. They opposed any unilateral action.

Cont'd

Representatives of Mexico, Venezuela, Iran, Tanzania, Romania, China and other countries shared the view that extensive consultations on the basis of equality should be held with representatives of all countries by the committees of the conference while they were drafting a unified text for consultation. During the discussions on territorial sea, continental shelf, economic zones and other important questions of substance, all states should have the right of equal participation and the interests of the developing countries must be fully respected and considered. It would never do for a few people to draft the text privately and then impose it on others.

Representatives of Algeria, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Guinea, and Tunisia also stressed that the pressure and threat of certain powers must be rejected.

The U.S. and Soviet representatives also spoke at the meeting. The Soviet representative asserted that concrete agreements on the problem of economic zone can only be reached in consideration of "the profit of parties concerned". Therefore, there was need of mutual "understanding" and "compromise". He called for a so-called package solution, which is exactly what the United States has been seeking.

In reply to the speeches of the U.S. and Soviet representatives, the Peruvian delegate pointed out that the old system of the law of sea served colonialism and hegemonism as well as aggressive actions of marine hegemonism. He said that today, the marine powers still tried stubbornly to defend their attitudes from any change; but, the work for a new system of the law of sea, has become a trend of history.

The delegate of Ecuador said: The representative of a big power talked about his country's favour of "understanding" and "compromise", but it was precisely this power which had made no concrete concession on the issues of strait and economic zone. The slow progress of the conference was exactly due to what the marine powers had done to maintain their vested interests, he added.

SOVIETS OBSTRUCT FUEL SUPPLIES TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Peking NCNA in English 1214 GMT 18 Apr 75 OW

[Text] Peking, April 18, 1975 (HSINHUA)--Of late, the Soviet revisionists have been creating obstacles in the supply of fuel to Czechoslovakia, bringing difficulties to the latter's national economy.

With its rich coal deposits, Czechoslovakia is traditionally a coal producer. Before the 1960's, its fuel and power industry relied almost entirely on home-produced coal. Czechoslovakia is also one of the European countries with the richest uranium deposits. By means of what they call "international division of labour", "specialization in production" and "economic integration" within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, the Soviet revisionists have fully controlled the mining of Czechoslovak uranium. As a result, Czechoslovakia is deprived of its own strategical material and energy resource.

Coal mining in Czechoslovakia is also subjected to restrictions, and production in the 1970's has actually declined. Coal output in 1974 was 3 percent less than in 1971. The use of coal as fuel for heat energy including electricity has dropped gradually, whereas the consumption of oil and natural gas, both imported from the Soviet Union, has more than doubled since 1965.

Coal has also been replaced gradually by oil and natural gas as raw material in the chemical industry. In this way, Czechoslovakia has become, in a large measure, dependent on the Soviet Union in fuel and power.

Almost all the oil and natural gas imported by Czechoslovakia during the 1960's came from the Soviet Union. Soviet oil and natural gas output was behind plan in each of the past few years. Beginning in 1967, the growth rate of oil output almost every year lagged behind that of oil consumption. The Soviet revisionist leading clique, however, continued to greatly increase oil and natural gas exports to the West in exchange for Western capital and equipment.

To shift their economic difficulties onto others, the Soviet revisionists have been reluctant to meet the needs of Czechoslovakia and other East European countries in oil and natural gas. In 1973 they even failed to supply Czechoslovakia with the quota of oil specified by contract. In 1974, the Soviet Union agreed only to supply Czechoslovakia with 14 million tons of oil, 12 percent less than the need of the latter.

In "coordination" with the next 5-year plan beginning 1976, Czechoslovakia's original plan for importing oil and natural gas from the Soviet Union was rejected by Moscow. Czechoslovak newspapers disclosed that in the light of the results of the Czechoslovak-Soviet talks, Czechoslovakia has to slow down its fuel imports in the next 5 years. Consequently, the growth rate of oil imports for the next 5-year plan (1976-1980) is estimated to be only half that of the present 5-year plan (1971-1975). Meanwhile, the growth rate of natural gas imports will also be greatly reduced.

Whether or not Czechoslovakia can import what it needs in accordance with the reduced plan will depend on the successful solution to its participation in the exploitation of the Orenburg natural gas resources in the Soviet Union. Referring to this state of affairs, the Czechoslovak journal SVET HOSPODARSTVI said in its February issue that the consumption of primary fuel-power resources over every 5-year plan period in Czechoslovakia increased by about one-fourth, but in the present circumstances, "only an increase of about 15 percent can be considered" over the next 5-year plan period. Therefore, the next 5-year plan will be Czechoslovakia's "most difficult period" in fuel.

The Soviet revisionists first monopolized fuel supply to make Czechoslovakia dependent on them; now they restrict fuel supply to shift their economic difficulties onto Czechoslovakia. This is the truth about the Soviet revisionists' "international cooperation" with their East European "fraternal countries".